



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

avowedly does not love, who is likewise wealthy, after having very frankly set forth the whole situation to her lover. The descriptions of the moods of the two men immediately after the wedding are almost identical. In *Passionate Friends* Stephen meets Mary for the first time after her marriage at a ball. There is a similar incident in *Dominique*, and a great resemblance in the portrayal of the conflicting emotions of the two men, with even such minor details as the admiration of the gowns worn by the two women, and the difficulty in realizing that these are the same young women they loved, so dazzled are they by the splendor about them.

Mary and Madeleine are two different types of women. Mary is brilliant and headstrong. Intellectually she is even the superior of Stephen. Madeleine also possesses a very strong will but she is much gentler than Mary. Both women have in common their overpowering passion mingled with a deep sensibility for the beauty of Nature. Nature in both books plays somewhat the same rôle as in Goethe's *Werther*. In *Dominique* we have no serious *exposé* of social theories as in the novel of Wells, and yet Dominique chooses a life in which he would be of greatest service to the community of which he is a member. Deeds are often better than words! Stephen marries partly at the instigation of Mary. After several years of anguish Mary puts the only possible obstacle between her and Stephen, death by suicide. Madeleine, after at last having confessed her love for Dominique (she never allowed him to learn it until now), once her secret is known, forbids Dominique to see her again and advises him to marry, saying that when he shall have forgotten her she will be either dead or happy. In *Dominique* we have a pure idyl. *Passionate Friends*, on the contrary, is an exceedingly modern book, full of intrigues and scandal; yet in spite of it all the reader is left in very much the same mood as after reading *Dominique*. That is the basis of my comparison. Both novels have a peculiarly quieting and purifying effect on the emotions. The æsthetic quality of the two novels is the same. It is this artistic, æsthetic treatment of the turbulent and

passionate theme that produces the effect just described. In music it might be compared to the *Adagio* of Beethoven's *Sonate pathétique*—sad yet sweet resignation with an occasional outburst of revolt.

HELEN J. HARVITT.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

#### A NOTE ON THE *Blickling Homilies*

*M[ar]pon*, as printed by R. Morris in his edition of the *Blickling Homilies*, p. 19, l. 23, has drawn the attention of several commentators. Zupitza, in his paper in the *Anzeiger für Deutsches Alterthum und Deutsche Literatur* I, 119 ff., simply says: "19, 22 (read 23!). *mar þon* entschieden unrichtig aber wie zu bessern?" Holthausen, in *Englische Studien* XIV, 393 ff., says "*þonne m[ar]þon* . . . *miht*. Ich schlage vor, *þonne* zu streichen und für *m—þon* das auch S. 89, 32 vorkommende *midþon þe* 'während' einzusetzen. Davor gehört aber dann auch ein komma, nicht ein semikolon, wie bei *M.*, und hinter *miht* ein fragezeichen, denn das ganze, von *Hwæt* (z. 20) an, ist ein fragesatz." Max Förster, in a paper in *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen* XCI, 179 ff., says: ". . . *faran* . . . *ondweard* = . . . *de loco ad locum venire*. *Quia ergo in divinitate mutabilitas non est atque hoc ipsum mutari transire est, profecto ille transitus* (d. h. vor dem Blinden vorüber) *ex carne est, non ex divinitate. Per divinitatem vero ei semper stare est, quia ubique præsens.* . . . Ein Wort *marþon* kennen überdies die Wörterbücher nicht. Wahrscheinlich ist zu schreiben *ne biþ on*. Das folgende ist jedenfalls verderbt: wer nicht den Ausfall einer Zeile annehmen will, könnte nach *omwendnesse* eine stärkere Interpunktion machen und statt *on carcerne* einen dem *transitus* entsprechenden Ausdruck, etwa nochmals *ondwendnesse* vermuten. Auch mit dem folgenden *miht*, welches Morris in der Übersetzung einfach ignoriert, ist so nichts anzufangen. Hiess es *of þære godcundan mihte*?" Neither of these conjectures is plausible.

ible, but Holthausen's proposal has this advantage over Förster's that it preserves the *m* of the MS., which there is no reason to reject.

I believe that the mysterious *marþon* should be read *mærþon*, and is another instance of *mærþum* 'miraculously, wondrously, gloriously.' This adverbial use of the dative plural of *mærþ(u)* is exemplified in Bosworth-Toller by two instances, taken from *Elene* and *Beowulf*. Morris translates the passage from *poune* to *gedcundan (miht)*: 'but, moreover, there was no change either of the divine nature or of the divine power in its imprisonment in the human nature.' 'Moreover' has no sense whatever in this clause; if we substitute 'miraculously' the sense is suited. If it should be objected that there is no corresponding word in the Latin text, I refer to the universal habit of the Old English translators to drop or insert words as appeared convenient to them. I agree with Holthausen that the sentence ends with *miht*, but I prefer to place a mark of interrogation after *oþerre*, and a period after *miht*. As regards the form *mærþon*, datives in *-on* are not rare in the *Blickling Homilies*: *eaxon* 121, 1; *earon* 121, 2; *hæton* 59, 4; *lufon* 23, 24; *dælon* 53, 12.

A. E. H. SWAEN.

Amsterdam, Holland.

#### BRIEF MENTION

For some years it has been evident that the relations between the *Goethe-Jahrbuch* and the Goethe-Gesellschaft were becoming more or less strained. Thus no 'communication' from the Archiv was printed in either 1912 or 1913, and 1911 was also the last year that the *Festvortrag* of the *Generalversammlung* of the Society was published in the *Jahrbuch*. In 1912 the establishment of a separate official organ of the Society was resolved upon and the first volume has now appeared under the title *Jahrbuch der Goethe-Gesellschaft. Im Auftrage des Vorstandes herausgegeben von H. G. Gräff*, Weimar, Verlag der Goethe-Gesellschaft, 1914 (8vo., 225 pp.).

Comparing the new organ with the older issues of Professor Geiger's *Goethe-Jahrbuch*—the publication of which has now ceased—we

find the rubrics 'Abhandlungen' and 'Mitteilungen aus dem Goethe- und Schiller-Archiv' retained, with the difference, however, that the *Abhandlungen* in the new organ are fewer in number and are all contributed by men of note (Walzel, Seuffert, Pniower). The rubric 'Neue und alte Quellen' is practically identical in scope with the heading 'Verschiedene Mitteilungen' of the old Year-book. Added is the category 'Mitteilungen aus dem Goethe-National-Museum,' represented in the initial volume solely by an exquisite reproduction of the painting of Goethe by George Dawe, accompanied by some two pages of explanatory text, which have evidently not found the place intended for them in the volume. The old rubric 'Miscellen,' always rather scrappy in character, is dropped altogether, as is also the Bibliography, whether wisely or not is open to question. Outwardly and inwardly the distinguishing character of the new as compared with the old Annual is a certain *Vornehmheit* that accords well with Weimar traditions. Perhaps in line with this is the change from a Latin to a Fraktur type, a change which will otherwise be regretted by many foreign readers.

*Les Aires morphologiques dans les parlers populaires du nord-ouest de l'Angoumois*, par A.-L. Terracher (Champion, 1914. xiv + 248 + 452 pp., and Atlas). While listing and classifying certain of the speech phenomena of a limited locality with a thoroughness and, to judge from equipment and method, a sureness difficult to excel, the author has not written a local dialect treatise in the ordinary sense. Instead, this is a fundametal study of the processes and possible causes of speech substitution, as tested in a small group of *parlers populaires*. The territory is northwest Angoumois, and the phenomena selected for observation are the inflexion systems there in use—a choice that needs no justification beyond the superior fashion in which morphological systems lend themselves to accurate observation. The geographical distribution of these phenomena is established with care, and shows for the territory covered no correspondence with physical or ecclesiastical boundaries sufficient to justify the assumption of a causal nexus. Mr. Terracher then proceeds to test the influence of speech-mixture upon the speech forms. This he does, not by means of assumptions or of specimen cases, but by positive data, and he has not hesitated before the colossal task of analyzing, for a period of one hundred years,